NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

| In re RAFAEL T., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law. | B262534 (Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. PJ50880) |
|--|---|
| THE PEOPLE, | |
| Plaintiff and Respondent, | |
| v. | |
| RAFAEL T., | |
| Defendant and Appellant. | |
| | |
| APPEAL from an order of the Superior | or Court of Los Angeles County. Robe |

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Robert J. Schuit, Judge. Affirmed.

Stephen Borgo, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

| No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent. | |
|---|--|
| | |

Minor Rafael T. appeals from the juvenile court's order sustaining a petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602. That order was made following the juvenile court's finding that minor committed a grand theft. The offense occurred on February 25, 2014, when minor removed a classmate's iPhone from her jeans' back pocket and refused her numerous requests over the course of two school days to return it to her.

The juvenile court found the allegation true. It declared minor to be a ward of the court and found the offense a misdemeanor, pursuant to Proposition 47. The court ordered minor home on probation.

We appointed counsel to represent minor on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to independently review the record. On June 18, 2015, we advised minor he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. To date, we have received no response.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that minor's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

LUI, J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

CHANEY, J.